EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential environmental effects that could result from the proposed development and operation of a mixed-use retail and housing complex that includes approximately 170,000 square feet of retail space and 425 residential units. The 10.9-acre development parcel is located at the southwest corner of Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) and Second Street (site of the existing Seaport Marina Hotel) in the City of Long Beach (City).

This section provides an overview of the proposed project and its objectives, and summarizes the potential impacts anticipated as a result of project implementation. The summary table (**Table ES.1**) included at the end of this section identifies these impacts and lists the mitigation measures recommended to reduce significant adverse impacts. Alternatives to the proposed project are also briefly described.

For a full description of the proposed project, its impacts and alternatives, the reader is referred to Chapters 2, 3, and 4 of this EIR.

Project Overview

The proposed project site is located in between the San Gabriel River and the Los Cerritos Channel at the southwest corner of PCH and Second Street in the City of Long Beach. The project site is roughly bounded by Second Street to the north, a retail center to the south, PCH to the east, and Marina Drive to the west. The site is located approximately five miles east of downtown Long Beach and approximately two miles south of the I-405.

The project applicant, Seaport Marina, LLC, is seeking to redevelop the proposed project site with up to 170,000 square feet of retail development and 425 residential units in structures up to five stories in height (maximum 68 feet). The proposed project is a retail/residential development divided into three blocks as follows:

- Block A is the northern block on the site bordered by Second Street and would include approximately 80,000 square feet of street level retail space and 127 residential units. This block also includes two outdoor plazas, one along Second Street and one along Marina Drive;

- Block B is the central portion of the site and would include approximately 60,000 square feet of street level retail space and 144 residential units. This block includes a large outdoor plaza on the west side of the site along Marina Drive; and

- Block C is the southern most block, adjacent to Marina Shores, and would include 154 residential units, a 16,659 square foot recreational/fitness center for residents and approximately 30,000 square feet of street level retail space.

The project would be oriented toward Alamitos Bay Marina to allow for visitor and residential access and linkages to the marina and other area amenities. The project would be designed to be compatible with surrounding uses in terms of building height and size. The proposed project would provide approximately 20 percent of the site as open space. The proposed project would also include a bike/pedestrian pathway along Marina Drive, and would encourage pedestrian activity between the development and the marina.

Demolition of the existing on-site buildings (164,736 square foot Seaport Marina Hotel) would be required to allow for project construction. Portions of the project site were used as both a former oil well site and service station. Although the service station has been removed and remediated, there is on-going groundwater monitoring; the former oil wells are required to be re-abandoned according to current state regulations; and any contaminated soil and groundwater associated with the abandoned oil wells (e.g., mud sumps) would be remediated during site excavation. In addition, a crude oil pipeline is located along the eastern boundary of the project site.

The project site is designated in the General Plan as Land Use District (LUD) No. 7 and zoned Planned Development (PD-1) (Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan [SEADIP]), Subarea 17.[1]

The project site and much of the surrounding area is subject to the Local Coastal Program (LCP). The LCP is an adopted component of the City's General Plan. It is also a California Coastal Commission approved land development and land use plan.

The project site is located in an urbanized area with retail and commercial uses that are located along the major roadways bordering the site.

- North: Uses along Second Street include a one-story grocery store and bank. The Marina Pacifica Mall, which includes larger retail, restaurant and entertainment uses, is located north of the grocery store and bank. These uses are setback along PCH, and all have surface and some subterranean parking. The area to the northwest of the project site is Marina Pacifica, a private

[1] City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building, *Land Use Element of the Long Beach General Plan,* revised and reprinted April 1997, page 169; City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building, *Zoning Ordinance (Title 21 of the City of Long Beach Municipal Code*).

waterfront community consisting of attached residences. The residences are condominiums, ranging from three to five stories in height. Also to the northwest is the Long Beach Marina with a boat launch located south of the Marina Pacifica condominiums. The area northeast of the site consists of a fast food restaurant (northwest corner of Second Street and PCH), oil wells and the Los Cerritos wetlands.

- South: Adjacent to the project site along PCH is Marina Shores, a retail center with restaurants, a grocery store, services, and other retail. This center continues to the intersection of PCH and Studebaker Road. Beyond Studebaker Road, southeast of the project site, are more oil infrastructure facilities and a two-story office building, to the southwest, and the San Gabriel River.
- East: Land uses near the intersection of Second Street and PCH include a service station (southeast corner of Second and PCH). Across from the site on PCH, is The Marketplace, a one-story retail center that includes several restaurants, a grocery store, many small retail shops, and movie theaters. South of the retail center on the east side of PCH, are several one- and two-story office buildings and the Los Cerritos wetlands. In addition, a crude oil pipeline and easement is located along the eastern boundary of the site.
- West: Directly west of the project site (across Marina Drive) is the publicly-owned Alamitos Bay Marina. The parking lot for the Marina occupies most of the area west of the project site (approximately 1,177 parking spaces). Along Marina Drive are restaurants and some boat related retail.

Project Objectives

As the population of Long Beach and the remainder of Southern California increases, additional housing and services, including retail opportunities are in demand. The development of the proposed Seaport Marina project would provide the residents of Long Beach and the surrounding area with expanded retail options and the region with new housing opportunities. The project site is located at the southeast gateway to the City. In addition to providing increased visibility of the waterfront for visitors and residents, development of the proposed project would provide an additional source of revenue for the City. The following guiding principles for the proposed project were developed by the City in January 2005:

Principle 1: The City will work with the applicant to create a vibrant retail center on the site. The City acknowledges that as part of this project, housing may be permitted, provided, however, that the housing is developed concurrently with the retail center, and that a truly integrated mixed-use project results.

Principle 2: The project should strive to meet public open space objectives currently set forth in SEADIP and consistent with the spirit and intent of the Parks, Recreation, and Marine Department's 2003 Strategic Plan.

Principle 3: The City will work with the applicant to ensure an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation near a wetlands open space resource and adjacent to an active marina.

Principle 4: The City will work with the applicant to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are adopted to ameliorate traffic conditions near and around the project site.

Principle 5: The project should strive to provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site. A well-defined circulation pattern will ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, and access to mass transit.

The following project objectives are based upon these guiding principles:

- Create a mixed-use project that includes a vibrant retail center on the site.
- Create an aesthetically attractive, high quality design that reflects the property's unique orientation adjacent to an active marina.
- Provide amenities that encourage and promote public access to the marina.
- Provide a high level of accessibility to and through the site to ensure a high-quality pedestrian environment, efficient vehicular access, and access to mass transit.
- Provide an economical reuse of the project site while minimizing adverse impacts to surrounding properties.
- Design and implement comprehensive site development standards that minimize adverse impacts to the environment.
- Enhance the economic vitality of the City and provide property tax, sales tax, and other revenue opportunities.

Areas of Controversy

Section 15123 (b)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR summary identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by other agencies and the public. For the proposed project this included:

- Potential cumulative effects of traffic impacts on local and regional roadways;
- Adequacy of sewer connections;
- Potential air quality impacts;
- Potential aesthetic impacts related to the proposed project's consistency with the area's character and scale of surrounding buildings.

Environmental Impacts

Chapter 3 of this EIR considers the environmental impacts associated with the following issue areas: aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; hazards; hydrology, water quality and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES); population and housing; public services and utilities; noise; recreation; transportation and circulation impacts, and other areas (biological resources). Table ES.1, included at the end of this chapter summarizes the impacts and recommended mitigation measures associated with the proposed project. As shown in Table ES.1, project impacts would be less than significant after incorporation of mitigation measures with the exception of the following:

- Air Quality – construction (ROC); operation (ROC, NO_x and CO)
- Traffic – project related impacts at the following intersections:
    - Seventh Street/PCH
    - SR-22 westbound on-ramp/Studebaker Road
    - Second Street/Studebaker Road (if the proposed Boeing project and associated mitigation measures do not proceed).

  In addition, project related impacts at the following intersections would be significant, because proposed mitigation and/or proposed improvements that affect the intersections would require additional agency approvals other than the City and therefore their implementation cannot be guaranteed:
    - Loynes Drive/PCH (proposed mitigation requires Caltrans concurrence)
    - Second Street/PCH (in the event Shopkeeper Road cannot be extended)
    - Second Street/Marina Drive (proposed new signal on PCH requires Caltrans concurrence)
- Traffic – cumulative impacts at the following intersections:
    - Atherton Street/Bellflower Boulevard (AM/PM peak hours)
    - Seventh Street/Park Avenue (AM/PM peak hours)
    - Seventh Street/PCH (AM/PM peak hours)
    - Seventh Street/Bellflower Boulevard (AM/PM peak hours)
    - SR-22 westbound on-ramp/Studebaker Road (PM peak hour)

- Second Street/Bay Shore Avenue (PM peak hour)
- Second Street/Studebaker Road (AM peak hour)
- PCH/Seal Beach Boulevard (AM peak hour)
- PCH/Loynes Drive (AM/PM/Saturday peak hours)
- Second Street/PCH (AM/PM/Saturday peak hours)
- Studebaker Road/PCH (AM/PM peak hours)

Alternatives to the Project

CEQA requires that "*an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effect of the project*…." (*CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6 (a)). The discussion must focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of lessening significant impacts, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives, or be more costly (Section 15126.6 (b)). The EIR is required to briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed and also identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process.

The specific alternative of "No Project" shall be evaluated along with its impact. If the "No Project" alternative is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Alternatives analyzed in the EIR include the following:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative - Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed project would not be constructed, and the existing Seaport Marina Hotel would continue to operate. The current ingress/egress on PCH would remain, and other circulation elements would generally remain in their existing configuration. Alternative 1 would not address the need for high-quality housing nor would it generate additional tax revenues associated with the proposed project and the site would continue to be underutilized. These needs are identified as high priorities for the City of Long Beach in both the Citywide Strategic Plan and the LUE of the General Plan. Alternative 1 would not meet any of the project objectives.

- Alternative 2: Retail Alternative – Alternative 2 (Retail Alternative) would include the construction of 350,000 square feet of retail space. Alternative 2 would likely provide at least two large big box anchors and smaller retail land uses, in

addition to other ancillary uses such as restaurants, a fitness center, and other related services. Under this alternative, it is assumed that structures would be similar to the proposed project in terms of height, density, and mass. Similar to the proposed project, it is assumed that subterranean and surface parking would be provided. Alternative 2 would be consistent with existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for the residential land uses. However, it is assumed under this alternative the design and layout of the site would be similar, therefore, Alternative 2 would require Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street, a Site Plan Review, a Local Coastal Development Permit, a PD-1 Amendment to allow residential units and a Tentative Subdivision Map. The Retail Alternative would meet six of the seven objectives of the proposed project in terms of providing a sales-tax generating economic opportunity that complements the nearby marina area.

- Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative – Implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would include construction of 140,000 square feet of retail space and 340 residential units, a reduction of 20 percent compared to the proposed project. The Reduced Project Alternative would include similar elements as the proposed project with a similar building design and characteristics. Under Alternative 3, the building height would be reduced to one- to three-stories, as compared to up to five stories (a maximum of 68 feet) under the proposed project. This alternative includes all other elements and amenities described for the proposed project (landscaping, etc.). Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include subterranean and surface parking. Alternative 3 would require the same discretionary actions as the proposed project. The Reduced Project Alternative would meet all of the objectives of the proposed project, although it would reduce housing and sales tax-generation opportunities in the City as compared to the proposed project.

- Alternative 4: Hotel/Retail Alternative – The Hotel/Retail Alternative would include 170,000 square feet of retail space (as with the proposed project) and a 130-room hotel (instead of the 425 residential units in the proposed project). No residential units would be constructed. In addition to the 130 guest rooms, the hotel would include other amenities such as banquet and meeting rooms, recreation areas (outdoor pool) and other ancillary services. Under this alternative, it is assumed that structures would be similar to the proposed project in terms of height, density, and mass. Similar to the proposed project, it is assumed that subterranean and surface parking would be provided similar to the proposed project. Alternative 4 would be consistent with the existing land use designations and would not require a General Plan or LCP Amendment to allow for residential uses. However, it is assumed under this alternative the design and layout of the site would be similar, therefore, Alternative 4 would require Standards Variances for open space and the setback along Second Street, a Site

Plan Review, a Local Coastal Development permit, a PD-1 Amendment to allow residential units and a subdivision map. Alternative 4 would meet all of the project objectives of the proposed project and would provide a sales-tax generating economic opportunity that complements the nearby marina area. Alternative 4 would not address the City's need for high-quality housing, although it would provide greater economic development and sales tax-generation opportunities for the City as compared to the proposed project.

- Alternative 5 – Oil Pipeline Relocation - Under this alternative, the 170,000 square feet of retail and 425 residential units included as the proposed project would be constructed. However, the existing oil pipeline/easement located on the eastern boundary of the project site would be moved 16 feet east of its current location (within the right-of-way of PCH). This would reduce the project setback along PCH from 28 feet to 20 feet. Implementation of this alternative would also increase the amount of excavation and would result in some disruption to traffic on PCH. All project components described under the proposed project would be included with Alternative 5. All project objectives for the proposed project would be met with implementation of Alternative 5.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics		
Impact 3A.1: Could the proposed project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3A.2: Could the proposed project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3A.3: Could the proposed project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	**Measure 3A.1:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permit, the applicant shall construct and maintain a solid security fence, around the perimeter of the site, the height of which shall be determined by the Director of Planning and Building The construction site shall be kept clear of trash, weeds, etc.	Less than significant.
Impact 3A.4: Could the proposed project create a new source of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area?	**Measure 3A.2:** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final project plans that all exterior lighting shall be limited to ground level and the plazas to accent project landscaping areas. Security lighting shall be used in the proposed project area such as in the plazas of the building and limited to project entrances, landscaping, as well as loading areas. All lighting shall be shielded to prevent "spillover" to adjacent properties. Demonstration shall be to the satisfaction of the Director or Planning or Building. **Measure 3A.3:** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final project plans that a the proposed project shall use non-reflective building materials and careful selection of exterior building materials as well as window glass treatments. Prior to the completion of final plans and specifications for each structural element of the proposed project, plans and specifications shall be submitted to the Department of Planning and Building for review to ensure that the selection of exterior building materials and window glass treatments would not create uncomfortable levels of glare on public roadways or surrounding redirected areas for the structural elements of the proposed project. Demonstration shall be to the satisfaction of the Director or Planning or Building.	Less than significant.
Impact 3A.5: Could the proposed project result in an adverse cumulative aesthetics impact?	None required.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality		
Impact 3B.1: Could project construction result in temporary adverse impacts to regional ambient air quality?	Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, SCAQMD Rule 403 and the following mitigation measures shall be included on the grading plans. In addition to SCAQMD Rule 403, the following mitigation measures are recommended to reduce ROC and PM_{10} emissions and minimize public health impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. **Measure 3B.1:** Water three times daily or non-toxic soil stabilizers shall be applied, according to manufacturers' specifications, as needed to reduce off-site transport of fugitive dust from all unpaved staging areas and unpaved road surfaces. **Measure 3B.2:** All paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas shall be swept daily using SCAQMD Rule 1186 certified water sweepers or recommended water sweepers using reclaimed water. **Measure 3B.3:** Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph) or less. **Measure 3B.4:** All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. **Measure 3B.5:** General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall have their engines turned off when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities shall be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts. **Measure 3B.6:** To the extent possible, petroleum powered construction activity shall utilize electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel power generators and/or gasoline power generators. **Measure 3B.7:** Heavy-duty trucks shall be prohibited from idling in excess of five minutes. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the plans the following: **Measure 3B.8:** Architectural coatings and solvents shall have an ROC content of 75 grams per liter or lower. **Measure 3B.9:** The applicant shall utilize building materials that do not require painting, as feasible. **Measure 3B.10:** The applicant shall utilize pre-painted construction material, as feasible.	Significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)		
Impact 3B.2: Could project construction expose sensitive receptors to increased levels of toxic air contaminants?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3B.3: Could project operations result in adverse impacts to regional ambient air quality?	**Measure 3B.11:** The applicant shall use light-colored roofing materials to deflect heat away from buildings. **Measure 3B.12:** The applicant shall use double-paned windows to reduce thermal loss in buildings. **Measure 3B.13:** The applicant shall install automatic lighting on/off controls and energy-efficient lighting, as feasible. **Measure 3B.14:** The applicant shall install solar panels on roofs to supply electricity for home heating and cooling systems, as feasible. **Measure 3B.15:** The project applicant shall ensure that construction contractors use architectural coatings limited to a VOC content of 75 grams per liter or less. **Measure 3B.16:** CO, NO_x, ROC regional emissions associated with the operation of the proposed project was shown to exceed the threshold of significance. The most significant reductions in regional and local air pollutant emissions are attainable through programs which reduce the vehicular travel associated with implementation of the proposed project. Support and compliance with the AQMP for the basin is the most important measure to achieve this goal. The AQMP includes improvement of mass transit facilities and implementation of vehicular usage reduction programs. Additionally, energy conservation measures are included. To the greatest extent feasible, the following measures shall be incorporated into the project to minimize public health impacts to sensitive receptors: <u>Transportation Demand Management Measures (TDM):</u> • Provide adequate ingress and egress at all entrances to the proposed project site to minimize vehicle idling at curbsides. • Provide dedicated turn lanes as appropriate and provide roadway improvements at heavily congested roadways. The areas where this measure would be applicable are the intersections in and near the project area. Presumably, these measures would improve traffic flow. Emissions would drop as a result of the higher traffic speeds. • Employers should provide ride-matching, guaranteed ride home or car pool or van pool to employees as part of the TDM program and to comply with the AQMP Transportation Improvements TCM-01 measure. • Employers should provide compensation, prizes or awards to ride-sharers.	Significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)		
	• Provide preferential parking to high occupancy vehicles and shuttle services. Also, the project applicant shall designate additional car pool or van pool parking. • Employers should provide variable work hours and telecommuting options to employees to comply with the AQMP Advanced Transportation Technology ATT-01 and ATT-02 measures. These measures allow employees to have compressed work weeks, flex-time, staggered work hours, or work out of their homes. • Develop a trip reduction plan to comply with SCAQMD Rule 2202. SCAQMD Rule 2202 has revamped the requirements for car pooling. In general, mandatory car pooling is no longer required. Compliance with Rule 2202 will be mandatory. • Schedule truck deliveries and pickups during off-peak hour traffic circulation. This will alleviate traffic congestion; therefore, emissions during peak hour will be lowered. <u>Energy Efficient Measures:</u> • Improve thermal integrity of the buildings and reduce thermal load with automated time clocks or occupant sensors. Reducing the need to heat or cool structures by improving thermal integrity will result in a reduced expenditure of energy and a reduction in pollutant emissions. • Capture waste heat and re-employ it in non-residential buildings. • Provide bicycle lanes, storage areas, and amenities, and ensure efficient parking management. This measure includes implementing the formation of bike clubs and providing additional bike racks, lockers, showers, bike repair areas, and loaner bikes. Also, provide lockers, showers, safe walk path maps, walk clubs and free walking shoes. • Provide local shuttle and transit shelters, and ride-matching services. • Synchronize traffic signals. The areas where this measure would be applicable are roadway intersections within the project area. • Provide lighter color roofing and road materials and tree planning programs to comply with the AQMP Miscellaneous Sources MSC-01 measure. This measure reduces the need for cooling energy in the summer. • Introduce window glazing, wall insulation, and efficient ventilation methods. The construction of buildings with features that minimize energy use is already required by the Uniform Building Code.	

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)		
Impact 3B.4: Could project operations result in adverse impacts to localized ambient air quality?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3B.5: Could project operations expose sensitive receptors to increased levels of toxic air contaminants?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3B.6: Could the project would be incompatible with SCAQMD, SCAG, and the City of Long Beach air quality policies?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3B.7: Could project emissions result in an adverse impact to cumulative air quality?	Same as **Measure 3B.1** and **Measure 3B.16**.	Significant and unavoidable ROC construction emissions and ROC, NO_X and CO operational emissions
Cultural Resources		
Impact 3C.1: Could implementation of the proposed project disturb previously unknown prehistoric archaeological resources and human remains?	**Measure 3C.1:** If archaeological resources, such as chipped or ground stone, dark or friable soil, large quantities of shell, historic debris, or human bone, are inadvertently discovered during ground disturbing activities, no further construction shall be permitted within 250 feet of the find until the City of Long Beach has been notified and a qualified archaeologist can be secured to determine if the resources are significant per the Criteria of Eligibility in the NRHP regulations (36 CFR 60.4) and the California Register of Historical Resources eligibility criteria (Public Resources Code Section 5024.1; Title 14 CCR Section 4852). If the archaeologist determines that the find does not meet these standards of significance, construction shall proceed. If the archaeologist determines that further information is needed to evaluate significance, the City of Long Beach shall be notified and a data recovery plan shall be prepared. The Data Recovery Plan shall delineate a plan and timetable for evaluating the find. The plan shall also emphasize the avoidance, if possible, of significant impacts to archaeological resources. If avoidance or preservation is not possible, the acquisition of data from the site or salvage through excavation that produces qualitative and quantitative data sets of scientific value may be considered an effective mitigation measure damage to or destruction of the deposit or components of it (Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(d)). Upon approval of this Plan by the City staff, the plan shall be implemented prior to reactivation of any project activities within 250 feet of the resources' boundary.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)		
	Measure 3C.2: If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of the origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The county coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner shall notify the NAHC, which shall determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or an authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of the human remains and items associated with Native American burials.	
Impact 3C.2: Could construction activities disturb previously unknown paleontological resources?	**Measure 3C.3:** In conjunction with the submittal of applications for rough grading permits for the proposed project, the City of Long Beach Director of Planning and Building shall verify that a paleontologist who is listed on the County of Los Angeles list of certified paleontologists has been retained and shall be on site during all rough grading and other significant ground disturbing activities in paleontologically sensitive sediments. In the event that fossil resources are noted within the project area, construction in the vicinity of the find shall be halted until the discovery can be evaluated. If the discovery is determined to be important, the project proponent shall initiate a paleontological recovery program to collect the fossil specimens and all relevant lithologic and locality information about the specimen. This may include the collection and the washing and picking of up to 6,000 pounds per locality of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils. The results of the fossil recovery program shall be documented in a technical report that includes an itemized inventory of specimens. Specimens recovered during grading activities shall be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation. All recovered fossils shall be placed within a museum repository that is capable of accepting the recovered fossils and that has a permanent retrievable storage. The project proponent shall be responsible for all costs associated with this recovery program and report preparation.	Less than significant.
Impact 3C.3: Together with other area projects, could the proposed project have cumulative impacts on cultural resources in the proposed project area?	None required.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils		
Impact 3D.1: Could implementation of the proposed project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse affects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	**Measure 3D.1:** Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final site drawings that earthquake-resistant design has been incorporated into the drawings in accordance with the most current California Building Code and the recommended seismic design parameters of the Structural Engineers Association of California. Demonstration shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building or their designee. Ultimate site seismic design acceleration shall be determined by the project structural engineer during the project design phase. **Measure 3D.2:** Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the design and construction of the proposed structures include methods for densifying and thus increasing the strength of loose, liquefaction susceptible soils at depth, such as columns and compaction grouting, as specified in the geotechnical report. Demonstration shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building or their designee. **Measure 3D.3:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that where the planned depth of excavation does not extend below the existing fill soils, the existing fill soils shall be removed and recompacted in accordance with the requirements of the appropriate governmental agencies. **Measure 3D.4:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that a temporary shoring system with lagging shall be required during project excavation. **Measure 3D.5:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that temporary and permanent retaining walls shall be designed for the recommended lateral earth pressures and shall be provided with a good drainage system. **Measure 3D.6:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that a registered geotechnical engineer shall be present on-site to observe grading operations and foundation excavations. **Measure 3D.7:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that on-site grading shall be performed in such a manner that alteration of stormwater runoff or erosion of graded areas would not occur. All areas of construction shall be fine-graded to direct water away from foundation and basement areas and direct water to the nearest available storm drain or to the street. Runoff at the project site shall not be allowed to flow in an uncontrolled manner, especially over any permanent or temporary slopes.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils (cont.)		
	Measure 3D.8: Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that where there is sufficient space for sloped excavations, temporary cut slopes may be made according to the recommendations of the geotechnical report. However, the stability of the graded slopes shall be addressed when grading plans are completed for the proposed development. Vertical excavations heights shall be in accordance with the geotechnical investigation recommendations. **Measure 3D.9:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that if temporary excavation slopes are to be maintained during the rainy season, all drainage shall be directed away from the top of the slope. No water shall be allowed to flow uncontrolled over the face of any temporary or permanent slope. **Measure 3D.10:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that water shall not be allowed to pond at the top of the excavation or allowed to flow into the excavation. **Measure 3D.11:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that where sufficient space for sloped excavations is not available, shoring shall be used. The shoring system may consist of soldier piles and lagging. **Measure 3D.12:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that final shoring plans, specifications, and designs for walls below grade shall be reviewed and approved by a geotechnical engineer. **Measure 3D.13:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall demonstrate on the final grading plans that a drainage system shall be placed at the bases of building walls below grade.	
Impact 3D.2: Could the proposed project be subject to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	**Measure 3D.14:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall have an approved Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). The WQMP shall identify the site design, source control and treatment control BMP's that would be implemented on the site to control predictable pollutant runoff.	Less than significant.
Impact 3D.3: Could the proposed project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence liquefaction, or collapse?	**Measure 3D.15:** As specified in the geotechnical investigation, site-specific final design evaluation and grading plan review shall be performed by the project geotechnical consultant prior to the start of grading to verify that recommendations developed during the geotechnical design process are appropriately incorporated in the project plan. Design and grading construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the California Building Code applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the recommendations of the project geotechnical consultant as summarized in the geotechnical investigation, subject to review by the Director of Planning and Building or their designee prior to the issuance of any grading permits.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils (cont.)		
	Measure 3D.16: Site preparation (removal of existing facilities, excavation, subgrade preparation, placement and compaction of fill, foundation preparation, floor slab preparation, positive surface gradient preparation, and pavement of other areas) shall be conducted consistent with the recommendations of the design-level detailed geotechnical investigation, subject to review and approval by the Director of Planning and Building or their designee prior to the issuance of any grading permits. The project geotechnical engineer shall observe all excavations, subgrade preparation, and fill activities and shall conduct soil testing as necessary, consistent with local, state, and federal regulations.	
Impact 3D.4: Could the proposed project with other area projects have cumulative impacts on geology and soils in the project area?	None required.	Less than significant.
Hazards		
Impact 3E.1: Would the proposed project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	**Measure 3E.1:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the project applicant shall submit an application to the Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) for approval to re-abandon wells and remove any pipeline conveyance systems from the property. The LBFD shall review the application for compliance with local, state, and federal requirements with well- and pipeline-handling procedures including sampling of subsurface soils and transport and disposal of tanks and soils/liquids. The LBFD shall oversee and monitor the operation in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements. **Measure 3E.2:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, all identified asbestos containing materials (ACMs), and lead-based paints (LBPs) shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (for example, SCAQMD) and to provide safety to workers and the adjacent community. The project applicant shall provide documentation (for example, all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring test results) to the City of Long Beach Health Department showing that abatement of any ACMs, LBPs, or PCB-containing electrical fixtures identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agency(ies) (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and CCR Title 8, Article 2.6). **Measure 3E.3:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the project applicant shall submit an Emergency Action Plan to the Long Beach Fire Department for review and approval. The plan shall be consistent with local, state, and federal regulations and shall provide detailed procedures in the event of a hazardous substance leak or spill from on-site conveyance systems and associated equipment.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Hazards (cont.)		
	Measure 3E.4: Prior to the issuance of any grading permit and after removal of the pipeline conveyance systems, and hazardous materials storage area(s), a detailed soil matrix investigation workplan shall include sampling for petroleum. The purpose of the investigation will be to confirm the previously reported remediation at the site and to delineate the reported soil impact at the site. The Long Beach CUPA will determine whether groundwater sampling is required. The Long Beach CUPA shall review the workplan and shall list any additional requirements. Implementation of the workplan shall be overseen by the Long Beach CUPA for compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Any additional sampling or soil or groundwater removal shall be subject to these same regulations. After remediation activity is completed to the satisfaction of the Long Beach CUPA or the RWQCB, a No Further Action Letter is to be issued prior to the commencement of rough grading. The project applicant shall also perform a subsurface soil sampling to determine if petroleum has impacted the subsurface soil in the location of the previously identified oil sumps in the northern area of the site and in the area of the suspected mud pit and/or areas of dark stained soil noted in the Phase I Environmental Assessment historical aerial photographs. **Measure 3E.5:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall submit a Soil and Air Monitoring Program and associated Health and Safety Plan to the City of Long Beach Planning and Building Department, SCAQMD, and the Long Beach CUPA for review and approval. The program shall be consistent with local, state, and federal regulations and shall encompass all soil-disturbance activities. The Health and Safety Plan shall include the following components: • A summary of all potential risks to construction workers, monitoring programs, maximum exposure limits for all site chemicals, and emergency procedures; • The identification of a site health and safety officer; • Methods of contact, phone number, office location, and responsibilities of the site health and safety officer; • Specification that the site health and safety officer shall be immediately contacted by the construction contractor should any potentially toxic chemical be detected above the exposure limits or if evidence of soil contamination is encountered during site preparation and construction; • Specification that the Long Beach CUPA shall be notified of evidence of soil contamination is encountered; and • Specification that an on-site monitor will be present to perform monitoring and/or soil and air sampling during grading, trenching, or cut and fill operations.	

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Hazards (cont.)		
	Measure 3E.6: Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall perform a soil gas survey for fixed gases including methane, hydrogen sulfide, and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) in the area of the abandoned oil well to assess the possible presence of methane or other vapors associated with abandoned wells.	
Impact 3E.2: Together with other area projects, would the proposed project have cumulative hazards impacts?	None required.	Less than significant.
Hydrology, Water Quality, and NPDES		
Impact 3F.1: Could construction activities violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	**Measure 3F.1:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the following measures shall be incorporated on to the final grading plans to ensure that dewatering will not violate water quality standards and or waste discharge requirements: • Applicant shall submit a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) to the RWQCB prior to dewatering. As part of the ROWD, groundwater quality testing shall be conducted to determine that dewatered water quality is adequate for discharge. Groundwater sample analysis results shall be submitted to the RWQCB prior to discharge. • Dewatering shall be conducted in accordance with the Field Guide to Construction Site Dewatering, October 2001, CTSW-RT-01-010. • Periodic water quality samples shall be collected and analyzed during the dewatering activities to ensure quality of the discharged water. • If contaminates are reported in water sample results that exceed the RWQCB's discharge limits, discharge of dewatered water to surface waters shall cease immediately. Contaminated dewatered water shall be collected and treated prior to discharge, pursuant to RWQCB approval.	Less than significant.
Impact 3F.2: Could the proposed project alter the drainage pattern of the site and require the relocation of an existing storm drain pipe?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3F.3: Would the proposed project result in a cumulative impact to water quality and increased urban runoff?	Same as **Mitigation Measure 3F.1**.	Less than significant.
Land Use		
Impact 3G.1: Could implementation of the proposed project conflict with an existing land use plan?	Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall continue to work with City staff to address and satisfy the established Guiding Principles to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission.	Less than significant.
Impact 3G.2: Could the proposed project result in an adverse cumulative land use impact?	None required.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Noise		
Impact 3H.1: Could construction activities result in a temporary increase of ambient noise levels in the project area?	None required	Less than significant.
Impact 3H.2: Could construction activities result in exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive levels of groundborne vibration?	None required	Less than significant.
Impact 3H.3: Could increased traffic associated with the project result in a permanent increase of ambient noise levels in the project area?	None required	Less than significant.
Impact 3H.4: Could stationary noise sources result in a permanent increase of ambient noise levels?	None required	Less than significant.
Impact 3H.5: Could operational activities result in exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive levels of groundborne vibration?	None required	Less than significant.
Impact 3H.6: Could construction and operation of the project result in cumulative noise and vibration impacts?	None required	Less than significant.
Population and Housing		
Impact 3I.1: Could the proposed project substantially induce population growth in the project area?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3I.2: Together with other area projects, would the proposed project have cumulative impacts on population and housing?	None required.	Less than significant.
Public Services and Utilities		
Impact 3J.1: Could the proposed project significantly increase the demand for local fire protection services?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3J.2: Could the proposed project significantly increase the demand for local police services?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3J.3: Could the proposed project increase the demand for local schools?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3J.4: Could the proposed project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	None required.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Public Services and Utilities (cont.)		
Impact 3J.5: Could the proposed project result in a determination by the water provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project or result in the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3J.6: Could the proposed project result in significant increase the amount of solid waste that would require disposal at a landfill?	**Measure 3J.1:** Prior to the issuance of any demolition permit, a Solid Waste Management Plan for the proposed project shall be developed and submitted to the City of Long Beach Environmental Services Bureau for review and approval. The plan shall identify methods for promoting recycling and reuse of construction materials and safe disposal consistent with the policies and programs outlined by the City of Long Beach. The plan shall identify methods for incorporating source reduction and recycling techniques into project construction and operation in compliance with state and local requirements such as AB 939. **Measure 3J.2:** Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the City of Long Beach Director of Planning and Building shall verify that adequate storage space for the collection and loading of recyclable materials and waste collection points throughout the site has been included in the design of the buildings to encourage recycling.	Less than significant.
Impact 3J.7: Could the proposed project result in a cumulative impact to public services and utilities?	None required.	Less than significant.
Recreation		
Impact 3K.1: Could implementation of the proposed project conflict with City of Long Beach Recreation and Open Space objectives?	**Measure 3K.1:** The proposed project shall pay a per dwelling unit fee to the City of Long Beach in lieu of park land dedication in accordance with the City's Municipal Code Chapter 18.18.	Less than significant.
Impact 3K.2: Could the proposed project result in an adverse cumulative recreation and open space impact?	None required.	Less than significant.
Transportation and Circulation		
Impact 3L.1: Could the proposed project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?	Mitigation included as part of other projects is as follows: As part of the Boeing Seal Beach project, a change to the existing street system within the study area has been committed as part of that project approval. This improvement will add a westbound right-turn lane at the Second Street/Studebaker Road intersection. This improvement will allow westbound vehicles who wish to go north on Studebaker Road a separate turn lane and remove these vehicles from the through lanes, thus increasing capacity in the intersection. This change has been included in the with- and without-project scenarios. This mitigation is proposed as part of the Boeing Seal Beach project and assumed in this study, because the City believes this project and its mitigations will move forward. A significant cumulative impact would occur if this improvement were not made.	The 2009 level of service without the project, with the project, and with all proposed roadway improvements are shown in Table 3L.7. The project impact would be fully mitigated to a level of insignificance during each peak period at PCH/Loynes Drive, Second Street/PCH and at PCH/Studebaker Road. Significant project impacts will remain at the following intersections after the mitigation measures are implemented:

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (cont.)		
	Project mitigation measures would include: **Measure 3L.1:** At Second Street/Marina Avenue, the project shall restripe the northbound approach to provide two left, one through and one right turn lane; restripe the southbound approach to provide one left, one through and one right turn lane; and upgrade the traffic signal to provide protected left turns and overlap phases. This improvement will fully mitigate this project's impacts at this location. **Measure 3L.2:** The project shall construct a shared northbound right turn-through lane on Loynes Drive/PCH, along with the installation of new curb and gutter. The turn lane length would be approximately 150 feet. This improvement combined with the new traffic signal at the PCH main driveway would fully mitigate this project's impacts at this location. **Measure 3L.3:** A new four-lane roadway connecting Studebaker Road to Shopkeeper Road around the Marketplace shopping center shall be constructed as project mitigation. This roadway will provide a "bypass" route for some traffic to avoid the congested Second Street/PCH intersection. It will divert some northbound right turns and westbound left turns away from the Second Street/PCH intersection. The proposed new roadway shall include the following improvements: • It will be a new four-lane public roadway connection between the intersection of Studebaker Road/PCH and Second Street/Shopkeeper Road behind the Market Place shopping center. The applicant will be responsible for acquiring the necessary right-of-way and the applicant will be responsible for the design and construction of the new roadway facility. The applicant will secure necessary approvals from other county, state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over such projects to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building. • At the intersection of PCH/Studebaker, the roadway will have three departure lanes and two receiving lanes. Specific lane configurations will be determined at the time of design. • At the Second Street/Shopkeeper Road intersection, Second Street shall be modified to provide an additional westbound left turn lane (two total) and Shopkeeper Road shall be modified to provide and additional right turn lane (two total). Shopkeeper Road shall also be modified to provide two receiving lanes at the intersection. The traffic signal shall be upgraded to provide a northbound right turn overlap operation. An analysis was made of the new four-lane connection roadway. Using the regional travel demand model, this proposed link was evaluated and the number of diverted trips was estimated. These trips were then analyzed in the with-project conditions, and assumed a signalized intersection at the south (main) project driveway. The model	• Seventh Street/PCH • SR-22 westbound on-ramp/Studebaker Road • Second Street/Studebaker Road (if the Boeing project and associated mitigation do not proceed) In addition, the following intersections will require a Statement of Overriding Considerations, because proposed mitigation and/or proposed improvements that affect the intersections will require additional agency approvals other than the City and therefore their implementation cannot be guaranteed: • Loynes Drive/PCH (proposed mitigation requires Caltrans concurrence) • Second Street/PCH (in the event Shopkeeper Road cannot be extended) • Second Street/Marina Drive (proposed new signal on PCH requires Caltrans concurrence)

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Circulation (cont.)		
	showed that due to the congestion that exists at Second Street and PCH, northbound right turns and westbound left turns at this intersection would tend to use the new connector road, since it has available capacity and is less congested. The analysis further showed that there would be improvement in the level of service at the Second Street and PCH intersection and the PCH at Studebaker Road intersection, thus fully mitigating project impacts at those intersections. Figure 3L.4 shows the future four-lane connection roadway, and the proposed lane configurations at the Second Street and Shopkeeper Road intersection and the PCH and Studebaker Road intersection.	
Impact 3L.2: Could the proposed project exceed a LOS standard established by the County CMP agency for designated roads or highways?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3L.3: Could the proposed project substantially increase hazards due to design feature or incompatible uses?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3L.4: Could the proposed project provide inadequate parking capacity?	None required.	Less than significant.
Impact 3L.5: Could the proposed project result in an adverse cumulative transportation and circulation impact?	None required.	Significant and unavoidable.
Other Issues		
Impact 3M.1: Could the proposed project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	**Measure 3M.1:** To address the potential presence of nesting migratory birds and resulting MBTA and CFG Code impacts, within 15 days of any project actions that will cause a potentially substantial increase or other change in existing disturbance, the project proponent shall have a qualified biologist conduct a preconstruction migratory bird nesting survey. This survey shall cover all reasonably potential nesting locations for the relevant species on or closely adjacent to the project site. If an active nesting effort is confirmed or considered very likely by the biologist, no construction activities shall occur within at least 500 feet of the nesting site until measures to address the constraint are agreed to by the project proponent, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) personnel, and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) personnel. Potentially appropriate measures to take may include one or more of the following as authorized by the USFWS and CDFG: (1) delaying work at the nest site location until either the nest has failed (for non-project-related reasons) or seven days after the last young leaves the nest, or (2) taking the young nestlings to a qualified wildlife rehabilitation center. Note that in the latter situation, it will normally be necessary for the biologist retrieving the young to be properly experienced and permitted for the specific work required.	Less than significant.

TABLE ES-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION (CONT.)

Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
Other Issues (cont.)		
Impact 3M.2: Could the proposed project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Incorporation of **Mitigation Measure 3M.1** above would reduce impacts to a level of less than significant. See **Mitigation Measure 3M.1** for more information.	Less than significant.
Impact 3M.3: Could the proposed project with other area projects have cumulative impacts on biological resources in the project area?	None required.	Less than significant.